

safe, and maybe they weren't. There was no need to take them out to examine them. Anyone—including Mr. Livingstone, whose desk was just outside the entrance to the safe—could have walked in, sat down at the table and perused the files to his heart's content. And the security office was equipped with a photocopy machine. I knew Mr. Livingstone as a fierce defender of the Clintons, especially Mrs. Clinton, who handpicked him for this sensitive position.

Which of these files were copied, and where were the copies sent? The time has come for real explanations, real investigations of the Clinton White House Counsel's Office and, sadly, maybe even of the FBI. In particular, Mr. Bourke and Mr. Livingstone should explain their roles. These FBI files could not have been requested, received and maintained without Mr. Livingstone's full knowledge, consent and direction. Mr. Bourke is responsible for protecting the FBI files and for ensuring the FBI's arm's-length relationship with this or any administration.

These two men should be brought before both a federal grand jury and Congress to account for this highly irregular conduct—conduct that has embarrassed the presidency and the FBI, undermined the public's trust in both institutions and potentially violated federal law. The Clinton administration has earned its reputation. But the FBI—my FBI—deserves better. Enough is enough.

Listen to what Gary Aldrich, a former FBI official, writes: "Never before has any administration used background investigations of another President's political staff." How does a unit at FBI headquarters copy and box for shipment to the White House counsel's office more than 340 highly confidential files when the two FBI supervisors are both lawyers? Do the White House and the FBI really expect us to believe that the wholesale copying of hundreds of FBI files would not raise an eyebrow?

Oh, it raises more than an eyebrow, it raises serious questions. The American people deserve answers. This House will find those answers.

#### ANSWER TO THE QUESTION: WHAT IF IT WERE A REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION?

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I came to this floor to talk about this historic vote yesterday when all the judiciary Republicans voted unanimously against defining marriage as a non-adulterous, nonmonogamous relationship. I found that shocking.

Mr. Speaker, I really want to talk about something else now after listening to this. I want to congratulate the Republicans for being concerned about FBI files, and I want to congratulate this President for apologizing for what happened, and I want to say to the Republicans I can answer the question about what would happen if it was a Republican administration.

In 1972, when I was a candidate for Congress, our house got broken into over and over, our car got broken into, we kept having Jim's barber, my hus-

band's barber show up at our house. We could not figure out what was going on.

Many months after I got elected a man got picked up for breaking into a house, and he said, "You can't do this to me because I've been hired by the FBI to break into SCHROEDER's house."

That was the Nixon FBI. Not one Republican came forward and said anything about it, nor did President Nixon.

So, let us put this in context, please.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a sad day for the institution of marriage. The House Judiciary Committee voted down an amendment I offered that would have defined marriage as a nonadulterous, monogamous relationship.

For all their talk about family issues, not one Republican voted for my amendment. The party of family values failed to stand up for them when it counted. That's because in introducing the Defense of Marriage Act, the Republicans are far less interested in defending family values than in stirring up division and fear in the election season.

This bill is the first attempt in history by the Congress to define marriage. Traditionally, the power to define and regulate marriages has been entirely up to the States. What is the grave threat facing marriage that would prompt Congress for the first time in 200 years to sound the emergency alarm? Well, maybe in the next 3 years, the State of Hawaii, might recognize same-sex marriages.

But everyone knows that adultery is a far greater threat to marriage than the speculative threat of same-sex marriages, which not one State recognizes today.

Well, if Congress is going to define marriage, then I think it's important to make it clear in that definition that we do not condone adultery. But not one Republican was willing to make commitment to marriage.

Yesterday's committee vote showed who values families and who's just fooling around.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### BURRELL COMMUNICATIONS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this evening it is my pleasure to honor a distinguished citizen and corporate entity from my district, Tom Burrell and the Burrell Communications Group who on tomorrow, June 14, will celebrate 25 years of outstanding service to African-American consumers.

In this wonderfully diverse Nation it is essential that the broad span of American diversity be fully represented in advertising. It is good business because it extends the reach of corporate marketing efforts, and it is good social policy because it creates positive images of African-American culture, serves as a bridge of information and awareness among general audiences, and as a source of inspiration and self-esteem among African-Americans.

Twenty-five years ago as a young copy writer Tom Burrell affirmed that the best way to communicate with the black consumer is through the natural channel of communications, the African-American advertising agency. And thus began Tom's legacy of developing culturally relevant and sensitive advertising messages that have over the years generated business-building, award-winning marketing communications programs for some of our Nation's best-known companies.

Tom Burrell's creativity work embodies the highest level of professionalism. His award winning advertisements are often imitated by general advertising agencies. And most importantly he has never forgotten his community. Burrell Communications continues to be a significant training ground for young African-Americans in the advertising industry. Their work and financial contributions for the betterment of our community and our nation must not go unmentioned.

Tom has overcome many, many difficult obstacles in making these achievements, and some surely remain.

Mr. Speaker, it has always been one of my highest legislative priorities to work to improve conditions for African-American, women, seniors, and minorities in every aspect of this society. I first introduced The Non-Discrimination in Advertising Act in 1987, and I introduced H.R. 177, the Diversity in Media Act in 1995.

I am proud that I have been successful in amending a great deal of legislation over the past 23 years to make sure that minorities were included.

I would like to officially thank you Tom and the Burrell Communications